

## **REMARKS**

### **Present Status of Application**

The Office Action dated June 06, 2008, rejected claims 15 and 16 under 35 USC§102(b) as being anticipated by Klein et al. (US Patent No. 7,335,994). Claims 17-19 were rejected under 35 USC§103(a) as being unpatentable over Klein in view of Akram (US Patent No. 6,861,763). Claim 20 was rejected under 35 USC§103(a) as being unpatentable over Klein in view of Koh (US Publication No. 2004/0135266).

Claim 15 has been amended for providing more descriptions for clarification purposes. No new matter has been added to the application by the amendments made to the specification, claims and drawings. This Amendment is promptly filed to place the above-captioned case in condition for allowance. After entering the amendments and considering the following discussions, a notice of allowance is respectfully solicited. After entering the above amendments and considering the following discussions, a notice of allowance is respectfully solicited.

### **Discussion for 35 USC§102 and 103 rejections**

*Claims 15 and 16 were rejected under 35 USC§102(b) as being anticipated by Klein et al. (US Patent No. 7,335,994). Claims 17-19 were rejected under 35 USC§103(a) as being unpatentable over Klein in view of Akram (US Patent No. 6,861,763). Claim 20 was rejected under 35 USC§103(a) as being unpatentable over*

*Klein in view of Koh (US Publication No. 2004/0135266).*

Claim 15 has been amended to provide more descriptions for clarification purposes. Supporting grounds can be found at least in Figures 4A-4B and the related contexts of the specification.

Applicants submit that independent claim 15 patently defines over the prior references for at least the reason that the cited art fails to disclose each and every feature as claimed in the present invention.

Klein merely discloses a package component having stack dice.

The Office Action considered at least Klein's die 14, pad 68, pad 56, contact 18 being respectively comparable to the chip, bonding pad, bump pad and bump of this invention. Further, the Office Action alleged that Klein's layer 58, layer 50 (in Figures 5A-5C) being equivalent to passivation layer, protective film in this invention.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with such allegation.

According to Klein's figures 5A-5C, 6 & 7A-7H and the related statements, it is clear that Klein's layer 58 (alleged as the passivation layer of this invention) is formed **after** forming the insulating layers 50 (alleged as the protective film of this invention) onto the pads 68.

As concluded from the related contexts, "As also shown in FIG. 5A, the back sides 72 of the secondary dice 14 are not processed, but will subsequently be ground, or polished, to form the thinned back sides 48 (FIG. 1C) of the secondary dice 14." (Col. 8,

lines 2-6; FIG. 7E-7F), the back side 72 clearly remains uncovered during the process steps shown in Figures 5A-7D and layer 58 is formed over the pads 56 on the polished or thinned backsides 48 (FIG. 7G-7H).

In this case, the Klein reference lacks at least the feature “forming a passivation layer on the backside of the chip and forming a protective film on the active surface of the chip after forming the passivation layer” as recited in amended claim 15.

In addition, as Klein’s layer 58 is formed **after** the formation of pads 56, the teachings of the Klein reference is contradict to at least the feature “wherein after forming the passivation layer coated on the backside of the chip, the passivation layer is removed before forming the bump pad on the backside of the chip” as recited in dependent claim 19.

Regarding claims 17, 18, and 20, the Office Action further relied on Akram or Koh for teaching the mask layer or using a wire-binding machine.

As discussed above, the method of the present invention is patentably distinct from the prior art reference because Klein fails to disclose all limitations of independent claim 15. However, even considering the teachings of Akram or Koh relating to the features recited in dependent claims, the reference Akram or Koh still fails to remedy the deficiencies of Klein.

As a result, it is respectfully submitted that claims 16-20 patentably distinguishes over the cited references, either alone or in combination, for at least the reasons stated

Customer No.: 31561  
Application No.: 10/709,179  
Docket No.: 10544-US-PA

above as well as for the additional features that this claim recites.

Consequently, reconsideration and withdrawal of these 102 and 103 rejections are respectfully requested.

Customer No.: 31561  
Application No.: 10/709,179  
Docket No.: 10544-US-PA

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all pending claims are in proper condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Date :

August 6, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

Belinda Lee  
Belinda Lee

Registration No.: 46,863

Jianq Chyun Intellectual Property Office  
7<sup>th</sup> Floor-1, No. 100  
Roosevelt Road, Section 2  
Taipei, 100  
Taiwan  
Tel: 011-886-2-2369-2800  
Fax: 011-886-2-2369-7233  
Email: [belinda@jcipgroup.com.tw](mailto:belinda@jcipgroup.com.tw)  
[Usa@jcipgroup.com.tw](mailto:Usa@jcipgroup.com.tw)